Shakespeare and the Classical Past: Memory and Renewal
ISSN 2283-8759
pp. 69-93 (2024)

Venus and Adonis *(1593): Shakespeare's Translation Memory*

Laetitia Sansonetti

Venus and Adonis, a narrative poem adapted from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, was Shakespeare's first work to be printed with a dedication to a patron in which he claimed authorship. Although *Venus and Adonis* is not a translation in the stricter meaning of the term, and was not marketed as such, Elizabethan translation practices as originating in schoolroom exercises designed to improve mastery of Latin and reliant on memory techniques are crucial to understand how the poem was composed and how it was received. This article will argue that in *Venus and Adonis*, Shakespeare alludes to schoolroom exercises, and more precisely to the method of "double translation" advocated by Roger Ascham: that he composed his poem thanks to memories of grammar-school translations of Ovid, and aimed to trigger similar memories in his readers.

Keywords: Ascham, Roger, Clapham, John, commonplacing, computer-assisted translation, Golding, Arthur, mediated translation, pedagogy, Ovid

Venus and Adonis, a narrative poem adapted from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (one of the most popular texts from classical Antiquity in Elizabethan England – see for instance Baldwin 1944, 1.XXII and 2.XLI; Bate 1993, chapter 1; Braden 1978; Oakley Brown 2006), was Shakespeare's first work to be printed with a dedication to a patron in which he claimed authorship[1]. Although *Venus and Adonis* is not a translation in the stricter meaning of the term, and was not marketed as such, Elizabethan translation practices as originating in schoolroom exercises designed to improve mastery of Latin and reliant on memory techniques are crucial to understand how the poem was composed and how it was received. This article will argue that in *Venus and Adonis*,

1 I would like to thank Iolanda Plescia for her generosity as editor as well as the two anonymous reviewers for their most valuable suggestions.

Shakespeare alludes to schoolroom exercises, and more precisely to the method of "double translation" advocated by Roger Ascham: that he composed his poem thanks to memories of grammar-school translations of Ovid, and aimed to trigger similar memories in his readers[2].While my analysis is grounded in sixteenth-century practices, it brings together early modern and present-day translation studies by focusing on two issues in which the use of memory in translation is both central and problematic: mediated translation and the ownership of texts[3]; commonplacing and the definition of a textual unit[4].

Translation, past and present

Recent advances in computing science, with the threatening promise of dehumanising processes of thought that they sometimes carry, seem at odds with the values and practices that we associate with Renaissance humanism as a pedagogical movement, in particular when translation is concerned. While the more and more sophisticated automatic translation tools that are developed nowadays can be seen as

2 See Lyne 2016, 1: "how English Renaissance writers imitated, and how they remembered", "how their imitative works can be read as acts of memory", "how such works are about memory". Lyne's approach to the topic of memory and intertextuality is from the perspective of cognitive studies. Enterline 2012 analyses Shakespeare's evocations of his schoolroom experiences from the point of view of psychoanalysis. About *Venus and Adonis* in particular, see Oakley-Brown's assimilation of the rhetorical use of polyptoton on line 610 ("She's loue; she loues, and yet she is not lou'd") to a recollection of parsing practices (2016, 218). The poem's dedicatee, the Earl of Southampton, was educated privately, but this does not entail that we should envision two different readerships: there was continuity, or common features, between Latin-language teaching by private tutors and in grammar schools. Roger Ascham had been Queen Elizabeth's Latin tutor, but his book of recommendations was entitled "The Scholemaster".

3 On mediated translation in the early modern period see for instance Bistué 2013, Hosington 2022 and Belle and Hosington 2023. I am aware that a mediating translation is usually in a different language from the ultimate target language (e.g., a French translation mediating between an Italian original and an English version, or Latin between Greek and English). Here, I suggest we expand the scope of this mediation in order to link interlingual translation and intertextual processes through memory by considering a translation memory to be a form of mediating translation.

4 See Blair 2010 and Moss 1996.

the harbingers of the end of human translation, I would like to look at the relationship between human and machine translation from another perspective, arguing that current breakthroughs in computer-assisted translation need to be thought of in the quantitative terms inherent to computing science as developments in storage and information retrieval – two areas in which the Renaissance witnessed its own revolution, with the advent of the printed book. Taking my cue from the inspiring essays gathered in *The Renaissance Computer*, a collection that is now twenty-five years old (Sawday and Rhodes 2000), I will draw a parallel between Renaissance management of information and present-day technologies by asking what twenty-first-century advances in computer-assisted translation can tell us about memory in translation for early modern texts – and vice versa.

The editors of *Memory Before Modernity* claim that "in terms of mediality, the differences between modern and pre-modern memory are mainly ones of scale" (Pollmann and Kuijpers 2013, 22). And if we look at the definitions provided by Lynne Bowker in *Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction*, we find a continuum between past and present practices when it comes to "reus[ing] or recycl[ing] previously translated segments": "In the past, many people did not keep archives of previous translations, and those who did often collected them in an unsystematic way or in a form that could not be searched easily (e.g., on paper)" (Bowker 2002, 93). Simply defined, a translation memory is "a type of linguistic database that is used to store source texts and their translations. The texts are broken down into short segments that often correspond to sentences [… and] a translation unit is made up of a source text segment and its translated equivalent" (92). Concretely, a translation memory (TM) is a "parallel corpus" or "bitext" (92) that can be searched automatically for matches. The main advantage is the time saved because a machine can work on large quantities of data faster than a human being:

> When a translator has a new segment to translate, the T[ranslation] M[emory] system consults the database to see if this new segment corresponds to a previously translated segment. If a matching segment is found, the TM system presents the translator with the previous translation […]. The translator can consult this previous translation and decide whether or not to incorporate it into the new translation. (94)

As opposed to machine-translation tools in which the machine produces a translation which the translator then checks and edits, with TM the translation provided comes from a human being and the human translator is the one making decisions for discrete segments, instead of validating a full text (105, 116). Bowker underlines the questions that this practice raises, issues which have become more and more stringent with the development of more and more sophisticated tools to sieve data but which also remind us of key points in early modern translation and commonplacing techniques: "Deciding what constitutes a segment is not as trivial a task as it might appear to be" (94); "Given that a TM can be a valuable resource, both translators and clients are naturally anxious to claim ownership" (122)[5]. My key notion will thus be 'translation memory' taken in both the restricted meaning that it has in computer-assisted translation and, more broadly speaking, as the memory strategies on which translation processes rely and the textual memories that a translation can trigger in readers.

My starting point will be the parallel display of text and translation on which Latin teaching relied in early modern England, and in particular Roger Ascham's method of "double translation". I will then analyse the triangular relationship between Ovid's text, Arthur Golding's English translation (first printed in 1567) and Shakespeare's poem, which raises issues of ownership in the use of mediated translations. I will then turn to John Clapham's Latin version of another story from *Metamorphoses*, the tale of Narcissus (from Book IV), to show how Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* offers a reflection on commonplacing as identifying segments and a vindication of interlingual translation (Ascham's *translatio linguarum*) as opposed to intralingual versions of Latin texts (Ascham's *paraphrasis* and *metaphrasis*). This will lead me to ask whether the aim of memory and/in translation is reduplication.

Double translation and parallel displays

In *The Scholemaster* (published posthumously in 1570), Roger Ascham, Queen Elizabeth's once Latin tutor, provides advice to Latin teachers of school pupils. In the model which he advocates, after parsing (i.e.,

5 More recent sources provide similar definitions (see Mitkov 2022 and Melby and Wright 2023).

dividing into semantic and syntactic units) a text selected for its stylistic qualities (preferably Cicero) with the master, the pupil is left on his own to translate the Latin text into English, and then after a while, to translate his English version 'back' into Latin, aiming to approximate the original text as closely as he can (Ascham 1570, Cv-Ciir). Ascham returns to the same topic at the beginning of Book 2 of *The Scholemaster*, repeating his advice with slight but significant variation. Cicero is still the recommended set-text, and the pupil is expected to translate an English version 'back' into its Latin original, but this time the first translation, from Latin into English, is to be the work of the master himself, not the pupil: "translate it you your selfe, into plaine naturall English, and than giue it him to translate into Latin againe" (Ascham 1570, Kiiiv). The kind of "memory" (the word is used in this passage but not in the first statement of the method) that is put to the test here differs from the kind required when the pupil is translating his own version into Latin. As Colin Burrow has noted, "Students with good memories must certainly have found 'double translation' much easier than those who had painstakingly to reinvent their Latin originals from the ground up" (Burrow 2004, 14). Although a sufficient pause is to be observed between the two exercises, a pupil translating from his own translation back into the original will indeed remember the first stage (the parsing of the Latin original) more easily than with Ascham's second version of the method, in which the pupil is deprived of this first acquaintance with the specific text, although it be "some notable common place": what he has to translate is a version deliberately phrased in "plaine naturall English" for which he has to find Latin phrasings that are not just idiomatic but also idiosyncratic, reflecting Cicero's style, since the last step of the process, the comparison with the model, remains the same.

In this second iteration of his method, Ascham refers to another central element of humanist pedagogy, commonplacing. Burrow has drawn attention to the possible divergence between the skills that these two practices developed:

> where double translation encouraged a mastery of, and perhaps a servility to, the style and lexis of one particular author, commonplacing fostered a quite different set of implied attitudes: a phrase from *any* author might be set down under a particular heading next to a phrase from any other author, and often such phrases might be entirely divorced from any indication of authorship when they were set down in commonplace books. (Burrow 2004, 18)

But in Ascham's advice to schoolmasters, the stage in the process that involves commonplacing concerns the more advanced translator of the two, namely the master. This is in keeping with Ascham's belief that working from epitomes, or condensed abridged versions, is better suited to more advanced scholars: "This is a way of studie, belonging, rather to matter, than to wordes: to memorie, than to vtterance: to those that be learned alreadie, and hath small place at all amonges yong scholers in Grammer scholes" (Ascham 1570, Niiv). More generally, selecting, reordering, recomposing, reapplying, in short rewriting an author's work in the same language is a harder task than *translatio linguarum*, as Ascham explains:

> *Paraphrasis* is, to take some eloquent Oration, or some notable common place in Latin, and expresse it with other wordes: *Metaphrasis* is, to take some notable place out of a good Poete, and turne the same sens into meter, or into other wordes in Prose. (Ascham 1570, Liv)

Coming after *Translatio linguarum*, *Paraphrasis* and *Metaphrasis* and before *Imitatio*, *Epitome* is thus for more advanced scholars. Although he finds it best for personal use, Ascham gives examples of public epitomes that he deems worthy of note, one of which being that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* abridged by Willem Canter[6]:

> And although a man growndlie learned all readie, may take moch proffet him selfe in vsing, by Epitome, to draw other mens workes for his owne memorie sake, into shorter rowme, as *Conterus* hath done verie well the whole *Metamorphosis* of *Ouid*, [...] (Ascham 1570, Niiiiv)

Recent English translations, by contrast, he criticises for their use of rhyme as a poetic practice closer to "the Gothians" than "the Grecians" (Ascham 1570, Kiiijr).

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* does not feature among the texts recommended by Ascham for "double translation", but we can guess how Ovid's works could be used to teach Latin through translation by looking at a 1513 bilingual edition of *Ars Amatoria*, which for Daniel Wakelin "seems to be a textbook" similar to the many bilingual epitomes of Terence and Cato that were published at the time (Wakelin

6 Canter 1564.

2008, 467 about Ovid 1513). The two languages alternate in an interlinear layout, first English in smaller Gothic font, "as if a mere prompt" (Wakelin 2008, 467), and then the Latin elegiac couplets in larger Gothic. Sometimes, because the excerpts selected were so brief as to consist only of a few words, the two languages were on the same line, as with the *Floures for Latine spekynge selected and gathered oute of Terence, and the same translated in to Englysshe* (Terence 1534) and the *Vulgaria* tradition that dated back to the early days of printing (Terence 1483). Books in which the editor wanted to reproduce longer excerpts, or whole texts, had to alternate languages sequentially by dividing the texts into chapters (or scenes, for plays), as with Alexander Barclay's 1509 translation of Sebastian Brant's *Stultifera nauis* or John Palsgrave's translation of Gulielmus Gnaphaeus' *Acolastus* (1540).

The list compiled by Wakelin (2008, 405) for the first half of the sixteenth century shows that it was possible to print bilingual versions with the two languages on the same page in parallel columns as early as Alexander Barclay's translation of Sallust's *Jugurtha* in 1522[7], the Latin column being considerably narrower than the English one and therefore giving the visual impression of a marginal text, without quite enabling the two texts to run in perfect parallel any more than had been the case in Barclay's translation of a neo-Latin work in verse, Domenicus Mancinus' *De quatuor virtutibus* (1518). A change from folio to octavo format entailed placing one language per page, as with Robert Whittinton's version of Cicero's *De Officiis* (1534), printed by Wynkyn de Worde with almost perfectly-aligned texts, and in a series of translations by the same Whittinton over the 1530s and 1540s. According to Miller (1963, 165-66), it was against the tradition of *Vulgaria* that Ascham reacted by formulating a method for longer excerpts that had probably been in use for quite a while when *The Scholemaster* was published in 1570, about a year after Ascham's death. Combined with intensive learning of grammar (and sometimes opposed to it when it came to the *Vulgaria*, which purported to teach spoken phrases), translation from English into Latin was the privileged method to learn Latin (Binns 1990, chapter 16; Knight 2017; Ong 1959).

The issue of layout and the best format for translation memories is tackled by Youdale and Rothwell in their discussion of the use of

7 Terence 1520 was printed in Paris.

CAT tools to analyse existing translations, in their particular case a translation from Spanish into English by Youdale himself (Youdale and Rothwell 2022; see also Youdale 2020). They compare several layouts in different CAT tools and the screenshots they provide show that whether on a page or on a computer screen, offering a synoptic view of several texts in several languages draws attention to potential discrepancies between source and target, original and translation. If the sentence is taken as a reference segment, then examples in which two sentences are translated as one or one as two will show the limitations of this criterion – or will incite translators to adopt a more systematic approach to their work in order to be able to use TM more easily. The tendency of translated texts to be slightly longer than originals because of the explaining bias in translation is also immediately visually apparent. If, regardless of length, the CAT tool displays segments sequentially, not in parallel, with their translations, then the coherence of the text as a whole may be jeopardised.

In early modern English printed books, the several layouts adopted reflect a growing awareness of these issues corresponding to advances in printing techniques. Segments made of preexisting chapters of a given text and their consecutive translations would be more useful to masters needing to select adequate source texts than wishing to check word for word their pupils' translations into English (Ascham's method no. 1). Interlinear translations could only work downwards and on short segments, thus restricting the bilingual use to which they could be put as well as the length of the reference unit. Parallel versions on the same page could play on column length, as was the case of Alexander Barclay's translations, in order to have the same amount of text in both languages on the same page, and two-page displays juggled with fount size to reproduce this correspondence.

What is specific about Ascham's method is that the parallel text (or "bitext" in CAT terminology), with the original and its translation, exists virtually for most of the exercise itself, precisely because the method depends on memory. The passage selected by the master has to be parsed and then reproduced whole by the pupil in another language. When this stage has been completed, the master's review of the pupil's translation brings together the two texts as a dual unit and assesses the quality of the "matches" (another CAT term). When the pupil starts from his own, or from the master's English version

(method no. 2), and tries to produce a text that is as close as possible to the Latin original, the source is both origin and target and thus serves as the ultimate translation memory against which to compare the pupil's own attempt. The results of these translation exercises from Latin into English and from English into Latin can be integrated into the pupil's own translation memory (in the pre-computer sense of the term), with the specificity that the Latin versions are just as much the products of translative processes as the English ones. This reversible translative relationship between origin and target, which is the test by which CAT TM are assessed (segments are expected to "match" each other as fully as possible in the two languages), appears to be crucial in Shakespeare's creative process when he uses an existing English translation of Ovid's Latin text with a critical eye, correcting it according to Ascham's requirement of back-translatability.

Shakespeare, Ovid and Golding: double translation

As recalled by Burrow, we have no records from the King's Free Grammar School in Stratford-upon-Avon for the period of Shakespeare's childhood (Burrow 2004, 11). Yet since T. W. Baldwin's monumental study of grammar-school curricula in Shakespeare's England, we have a precise idea of what Shakespeare the grammar-school boy probably studied in a cursus grounded in Latin, from grammar to rhetoric (see Baldwin 1944, and the summary in Bate 1993). It seems to be a truth universally acknowledged among critics that Shakespeare used Book X of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* both in its Latin original and in Golding's translation to create his narrative poem *Venus and Adonis*. There have been detailed studies of his composition process (Bate 1993, chapter 2; Martindale and Martindale 1990, chapter 2; Kiernan 2000; Roe 2000) and one may wonder whether there is anything new to add[8]. I think that placing Golding's translation in the context of Ascham's method can yield interesting results.

Raphael Lyne has insisted on the "language of heightened Englishness" used by Golding in his translation: "Golding often replaces Latin words with strong and specific cultural associations with Eng-

8 See also Stapleton 1997 about Shakespeare's borrowings from another Ovidian text, *Ars Amatoria*.

lish equivalents with English associations, rather than attempting to capture the original in paraphrase" (2001, 53; 54)[9]. Lyne concludes that Golding is engaging in the "competitive" type of imitation defined by George W. Pigman as "'eristic'" (Pigman 1980, quoted in Lyne 2001, 54). But this is also reminiscent of Ascham's advice to schoolmasters to provide their pupils with a translation of a Latin commonplace passage in "plaine naturall English" (Ascham 1570, Kiiiv, quoted above). We can thus view Golding's relation to his source text as one of translingual rivalry, but also as one of pedagogical transmission, matching the moral pedagogical programme put forward in the dedicatory epistle to Robert Dudley and in the preface to the reader (in Ovid 1567). But Liz Oakley-Brown, commenting on Lyne's analysis, has noted that "Golding's own rendition of Venus and Adonis is not especially Englished" (Oakley-Brown 2017, 33) – which means that it could have provided an incentive for a younger poet to "English" it more (success)fully. Golding may have been a grammar-school pupil himself; he went to university but seems to have left Cambridge without a degree (Considine 2004), which placed him a little above Shakespeare in terms of classical education. If we look upon the two writers, Golding in the mid-1560s and Shakespeare in the early 1590s[10], as translators wavering between the two roles in the process of double translation detailed by Ascham, that of the pupil (in Book 1 of *The Scholemaster*) and that of the master (in Book 2), I think we can understand better the triangulation between Ovid's text, Golding's, and Shakespeare's. I will take two examples, one grammatical and one lexical, to illustrate how Shakespeare presents his text as correcting Golding's translation or as emulating (and outdoing) it.

In Book X of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the story of Venus and Adonis is told by Orpheus, an embedded narrator who also relates the fates of Hyacinth, the Propoetides, and Pygmalion, Adonis's ancestor via the incestuous Myrrha. Famous for his talent as a poet, Orpheus can be expected to fascinate his audience with his tales of

9 See also Bate 1993, 29, who speaks about Golding's "robust vernacular vocabulary" and calls Golding's translation "an important precedent for Shakespeare's own combinations of the native and the classical."

10 Incidentally, Golding was 29 when the first instalment of his translation of Ovid (the first four books) came out in 1565, and Shakespeare was also 29 when *Venus and Adonis* was first published in 1593.

doomed love (see *Metamorphoses* X.64-105 for the impact of his singing on natural elements). One of the rhetorical tools contributing to his efficacy as a narrator in creating *enargeia*, vividness[11], is his use of the narrative present. When telling of Venus's *innamoramento* with Adonis, Orpheus uses present forms which Golding translates with past forms in English. In particular, in describing Adonis's beauty, the transition from child to man is rendered with the anaphora of *jam* (already) and the present tense: "iam iuvenis, iam vir, iam se formosior ipso est: / iam placet et Veneri matrisque ulciscitur ignes" (523-24). Golding uses the past tense to render these lines: "Anon a stripling hee became, and by and by a man, / And every day more beawtifull than other he becam, / That in the end Dame Venus fell in love with him" (Ovid 1567, 602-04). Ovid's Orpheus has atemporal formulae, such as "quae causa, roganti" (to him asking for what reason) and "ait" (from *aio*, to say), a form that is used both for the present and the past tense (552-553), and plays upon "ait" to trigger a switch from present to past and past to present ("ait […] pressit […] ait […] interserit", 553; 557; 559). Golding's Orpheus manages the same ambiguity for the first occurrence but has to make choices for the conjugated verbs: "Too him demaunding why? / A monstrous chaunce (q[uoth] *Venus*) I will tell thée by and by, […] / They sate them downe anon. / […] Shée thus began: and in her tale shée bussed him among") (Ovid 1567, 640-41; 645; 647).

Although a word for word comparison is not possible, we can see instances in which the Ovidian strategy of alternating verb tenses is put to good use by Shakespeare's unidentified narrator. The first four lines of the poem set the scene with a series of past tenses, immediately followed by present forms in the first stanza's rhyming couplet to create a sharp contrast that adds vividness to the encounter ("Sick-thoughted Venus makes amaine vnto him, / And like a bold fac'd suter ginnes to woo him", *Venus and Adonis*, 5-6)[12] before switching back to the past with a set phrase evocative of Golding's

11 See the definition in Puttenham 1589, Rijr: "to satisfie & delight th'eare onely by a goodly outward shew set vpon the matter with wordes, and speaches smothly and tunably running: […] that first qualitie the Greeks called *Enargia,* of this word *argos,* because it geueth a glorious lustre and light".

12 Shakespeare 1593, available online:
https://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Ven_Q1/index.html (ed. Hardy M. Cook).

translation of "ait": ("thus she began") (7). The difference between Venus's eagerness and Adonis's reluctance is also enhanced by the choice of tenses – present for the goddess, past for the young man: "With this she ceazeth on his sweating palme" (25) and "The studded bridle on a ragged bough, / Nimbly she fastens" (37-38) frame Adonis's helplessness, as "Ouer one arme the lustie coursers raine, / Vnder her other was the tender boy, / Who blusht, and powted in a dull disdaine" (31-33). Conversely, when Venus's speech is interrupted because the sun burns too hot and Adonis seizes this opportunity to speak and try to break free, the past is associated with Venus and the present with Adonis, with the same clever use of the rhyming couplet to change the tone: "By this the loue-sicke Queene began to sweate, […] / And now Adonis with a lazie sprite, […] / […] cries, fie, no more of loue, / The sunne doth burne my face I must remoue" (175; 181; 185-86). As we can see with this example, the question of whether Shakespeare had Ovid's text on his desk is less easily answered than that of whether he was looking at Golding's text while writing. Some specific features in Golding's text that depart from the Ovidian original seem to have reminded Shakespeare of Ovid's own strategies, to which his grammar-school teacher is likely to have drawn his attention in parsing the text, rather than of specific words or lines.

My second example is precisely a word used repeatedly by Golding where there was no equivalent in Ovid. Venus advises Adonis to hunt safe ("tutae", 537) preys, as she does, only "Pursewing game of hurtlesse sort, as Hares made lowe before / Or stagges with loftye heades, or bucks" (Ovid 1567, 622-23; cf. "lepores", "cervum", "dammas", 538-39)[13]. The motif of the *cervus*, a commonplace which for early modern readers merged several traditions, classical and Christian[14], becomes much more central in Golding's text than it was in Ovid's, through the homophony, and even homonymy sometimes, of the term 'hart' with the heart, where love is traditionally located. Golding tends to add 'hart(s)' in contexts where it is not the most obvious translation, amplifying the Ovidian text.

13 Here too Golding can be seen to normalise Ovid's text by putting all three nouns in the plural when in Latin *cervum* was in the singular.

14 See for instance Bath 1992 and Thiebaux 1974.

While "'harts'" (Ovid 1567, 637) is a close rendition of "'animos'" (549), in the line immediately preceding, "'Venerem movere'" is translated as "'too win the hart of Venus'" (635), thus adding a repetition. This is not an isolated case: "'invisumque mihi genus est'" (552) becomes "'And sure I hate them at my hart'" (640); in the embedded story of Atalanta and Hippomenes, the three occurrences of 'hart' similarly amplify the original text to the point of padding ("'nec forma tangor'" [614] becomes "'Neyther dooth / His beawty moove my hart at all'" [718-19], "'cum quo sociare cubilia vellem'" [635] becomes "'with whom I would be matched with all my hart'" [747] and "sollicita […] voce" [639] becomes "With carefull hart and voice" [752]). Given this isotopy, which he has created from a minor motif in Ovid's text, the appeal of 'hart' close to 'dear', which translates *carus*, proves irresistible to Golding: "'hos tu, care mihi, […] effuge'" (707) thus becomes "'Shonne / Theis beastes, deere hart'" (826-27). Thanks to the unfixed nature of English spelling at the time, 'deer' can be not only homophonous but also homonymous with 'dear', just as 'hart' conflates a stag and the heart.

Shakespeare makes this motif one of the structural elements in his own poem, down to the comparison of Venus to "a milch Doe, whose swelling dugs do ake, / Hasting to feed her fawne, hid in some brake" (*Venus and Adonis*, 875-76). But he focuses on 'deer' / 'dear' rather than 'hart' / 'heart'[15], and contrary to Golding, he chooses the spelling that is primarily evocative of love. Venus thus tries to lure Adonis with a body-as-landscape analogy: "'Ile be a parke, and thou shalt be my deare'" and "'Then be my deare, since I am such a parke'" (231; 239). Then when she advises him to hunt "'fearfull creatures'" that will not hurt him (677), she singles out "'the purblind hare'" who "'sometime sorteth with a heard of deare'" (679; 689) – Shakespeare's own version of Golding's "stagges […] or bucks" for Ovid's "cervum". He may have chosen 'deer', a word that usually takes no -s in the plural in English, because "cervum" was in the singular in the Latin text. More precisely, he chose "deare"[16], here as for the two occurrences which introduce the motif.

15 See the opening scene in *Twelfth Night*.

16 If we assume that he supervised the publication of this work, with whose printing he entrusted another former Stratford pupil, Richard Field.

With *Venus and Adonis*, we can see Shakespeare entering a sort of competition with his elder Golding to determine who has the better English text for a potential back translation after Ascham's method[17]. While with the example of verb tenses Shakespeare seems to pose as the pupil keeping closer to Ovid's strategies when translating into English with a view to back translating, in the case of the 'h(e)art' / 'deer/dear' pun he shows himself able to provide an English version "in plaine naturall English" akin to what Ascham expected of the master. Whether he had the two texts in front of him while composing remains difficult to establish, but we can imagine that reading Golding he was reminded of the original and either relied on his memory for particular points and general strategies or turned to a recent edition of the Latin text, such as the one printed in 1589 by the same Richard Field who was to print his *Venus and Adonis*. This brings us back to Bowker's second question about translation memory in CAT processes: who owns the text that is searched for possible matches to help produce a coherent translation? Authors like Shakespeare remembered their own schoolboy translations and could thus search their own personal TM for phrases and motifs, but that TM was always by definition collective, because of the input from the master in translation exercises (and maybe with the help of a manual such as those mentioned above), so that the production of an 'original' poem like *Venus and Adonis* relied on mediated translation[18].

Shakespeare and Clapham: translation vs paraphrasis/metaphrasis

Venus and Adonis is also the locus where Shakespeare develops another type of rivalry about Ovid in translation, one that echoes Ascham's advice to inexperienced pupils not to venture into rewordings of great authors in the original language, for fear of falling short of the mark. Very little is known about the education of John Clapham, the author of a poem in Latin entitled *Narcissus* which he dedicated to Hen-

17 Golding's translation was reissued in 1575, 1584, 1587 and 1593.

18 For lack of space, I cannot deal with the vernacular Ovidian traditions that served to mediate Ovid's reception in England, such as *Ovide moralisé* (for the Italian tradition in particular, see Mortimer 2000, chapter 5).

ry Wriothesley, earl of Southampton, two years before Shakespeare chose the same patron for his own mythological poem about a chaste boy and an overly eager woman inspired from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. According to D. R. Woolf, "Clapham does not appear to have attended either university, but entered the service of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, as a young man, serving as clerk to the lord treasurer from about 1590" (Woolf 2004). If the rivalry staged with Golding involved two grammar-school boys translating into English, here Shakespeare seems to have identified a use of commonplacing in Latin that made clear Clapham-the-clerk's incompetence as a poet. Clapham's poem has been analysed in detail, compared with Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and translated by Charles Martindale and Colin Burrow, and my own analysis will build on their study, focusing on one specific example which highlights the competition between writing a *paraphrasis* or *metaphrasis* in Latin with the help of ready-made commonplaces and producing a good poem in English with a view to crafting memorable phrases that will become commonplaces.

The opening line of Clapham's poem, "Ver erat, & roseis surgens Aurora quadrigis" (Clapham 1591, 1), starts with one of the most famous phrases in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where it refers to the Golden Age and its eternal springtime, but here it has been truncated to serve as setting for the scene: "Ver erat aeternum" (*Metamorphoses*, I.107). The phrase *ver erat* opened a poem by Ausonius that was associated to Virgil, "Ausonii Roase": "Ver erat: & blando mordentia frigora sensu" (see Virgil 1581, Qq3 and Ausonius 1575, m3r-v). As for "roseis surgens Aurora quadrigis", it "conflates two Vergilian phrases, *surgens Aurora reliquit* and *roseis Aurora quadrigis*" from the *Aeneid* (IV.129 and VI.535 respectively), as noted by Martindale and Burrow (1992, 148). The whole poem "is decorated with such typical epic features as ecphrases of time and place, which often recall some of the great primary loci in Vergil and Ovid", which Martindale and Burrow claim "illustrate the way Elizabethan schoolboys were taught to memorize, analyze, and imitate passages of Latin poetry" (1992, 148). If we heed Ascham's advice to teachers, we may nuance this interpretation by recalling that schoolboys, in Ascham's opinion, were not to be encouraged to paraphrase, because they were deemed too inexperienced. Likewise, epitomes were reserved for more mature scholars. And I think it was precisely to this beginner's mistake that Shake-

speare responded in *Venus and Adonis*, showing the clerk, who was two years his junior, what could be achieved in an English version.

Rather than cramming his lines with bits and pieces from Latin poets, Shakespeare alters well-known images so that they will still remind his readers of the original phrases but not evoke servile imitation or plain pilfering for lack of imagination. The opening lines in *Venus and Adonis* set the scene by establishing the time of day through the use of the expected deities, but with a twist:

> EVEN as the sunne with purple-colourd face,
> Had tane his last leaue of the weeping morne,
> Rose-cheekt Adonis hied him to the chace […]
> (*Venus and Adonis*, 1-3)

The dawn is not the one leaving, she is being left, an abandoned woman announcing Venus's fate in the poem, and the rosy colour is now associated with the main protagonist, Adonis, rather than with Aurora, while the sun's face is "purple". The two variations on red are phrased in compound adjectives that are reminiscent of Homeric adjectives (his rosy-fingered Dawn, for instance), a structure with which even a grammar-school boy with "small *Latine* and lesse *Greeke*" (Jonson in Shakespeare 1623, A4r) would have been familiar. And "purple-coloured" in the first line serves to link the poem with its epigraph through translation, since Shakespeare chose a couplet from Ovid's *Amores* that states the poet's disregard for the crowd: "Vilia miretur vulgus: mihi flauus Apollo / Pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua" (*Venus and Adonis*, epigraph; cf. *Amores*, I.xv.35-36). The epithet ascribed to the god Apollo, who was assimilated with the Sun in post-classical times, *flavus*, can mean "golden yellow" (for the hair), but also "reddish yellow", in particular to express modesty on a face (Lewis and Short 1879, "flavus"). Speaking of "the sunne with purple-colourd face" in the first line not only links the epigraph with the poem, it launches one of the central dual isotopies in the story, Venus's red-hot passion and Adonis's blushing shame. Indirectly, it also establishes Ovid's *Amores* as another Ovidian source for the poem.

As a reader, what you are expected to notice is not just the resemblance, it is the difference that goes with it. Your memory is activated not by an identical reiteration of the same but by a similarity that adds to the game of source-hunting. As with the pun on "deer / dear" that

revises Golding's excessive use of "hart", and contrary to Clapham's mechanical strategies of reuse, there is a thematic and narrative logic to the links drawn between the poem and the texts to which it refers: pointing to *Amores* is a self-reflexive gesture. There have been detailed studies of early responses to *Venus and Adonis* among Shakespeare's contemporaries (Roberts 2003; Sansonetti 2015; Tregear 2023). Rather than repeat the list of texts, poetic anthologies and plays from the turn of the century in which Shakespeare's lines are quoted, misquoted, and recycled, I would like to note how strangely evocative the deliberately parodic mentions in the plays are of Clapham's relationship with his Latin sources, a fact that validates the status of Shakespeare as a vernacular "classic" for his contemporaries, a provider of sententiae which inept scholars will reuse indiscriminately, piling one upon the other. The phrases that drew the attention of silly characters were often taken from the well-crafted beginning of the poem, such as Venus's hyperbolical "'Thrise fairer then my selfe'", a compliment which becomes ridiculous when it does not emanate from the goddess of beauty[19].

In a process that is typical of commonplacing, the differences between author, narrator and character tend to be erased as the phrases are ascribed to "Shakespeare". This sheds another light on Francis Meres's famous analogy involving Ovid and Shakespeare: "As the soule of *Euphorbus* was thought to liue in *Pythagorus*: so the sweete wittie soule of *Ouid* liues in mellifluous and hony-tongued *Shakespeare*, witnesse his *Venus* and *Adonis* […]" (Meres 1598, 281v-82r). When we look at this relationship as one that involves translation, then we can understand how metempsychosis can be a way for Meres to both evoke and bypass translation as a linguistic/lexical operation: through a fittingly Ovidian transmigration of soul from one body to another, Shakespeare can voice Ovid's sweet wit with his tongue. He becomes a new creator of Ovidian content, which can be in turn imitated and reused.

---

19 See for instance III.i in *The Returne from Parnassus* 1949, 183:
Gullio
Thrise fairer than my selfe, thus I began,
The gods faire riches, sweete aboue compare,
Staine to all Nimphes, [m]ore louely the[n] a man,
More white and red than doues and roses are: […]

The issue of ownership is thus seen to be coextensive with that of the basis for a 'segment' or unit in translation memory, an issue that is usually solved by TM systems with the choice of the sentence as a segment, but translators can also decide that a segment is a semantic unit which can be shorter than a sentence or run over a paragraph. This is the same question that early modern commonplacers asked themselves: what is the recommended length for a phrase to become a commonplace? I have discussed elsewhere the criteria given in turn-of-the-century poetic anthologies for their selection (Sansonetti 2021), and here I will just recall the motive given by the editor of *Belvedere* for excluding such eminent English poets as Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate: "because it was not knowne how their forme would agree with these of ten syllables only, and that sometimes they exceed the compasse herein obserued, hauing none but lineal and couplet sentences" (Bodenham 1600, Q6r). In Clapham's paraphrasis of Ovid, whose text he translated intralingually into Latin with the help of set phrases plucked from divers unacknowledged sources which he may have expected his readers to recognise, or which may have been so ingrained in his memory as a former pupil having learnt Latin by trying to reproduce stylistic models whose exact source he could not remember precisely, the link between commonplacing and memory is obvious. Shakespeare's translation of Ovid via Clapham proves his capacity "to absorb, animate, and transcend the poem", showing the common dedicatee of the two texts "vernacular literature growing an abundant life from a zestless and old-fashioned Neo-Latin prototype" (Martindale and Burrow, 152).

Origins and ends

Just as memory is not only storage, but also *recollectio*, the ability to remember and the activation of a particular memory[20], translation is not only a product (a translated text), but also a process, a starting point for more translations and a gateway to composition that can both promote variation and aim for exact reproduction. As I have tried to show with the example of *Venus and Adonis*, Shake-

20 On memory as *recollectio*, see Sullivan 2005, introduction. See also Engel *et al.* 2016; Hiscock 2011, and the references therein.

speare's Ovidian translation memory worked as a store of intermediate English versions (some published, some unpublished, some written, some oral) together with their Latin originals, as well as an incentive to back-translate English texts into Latin. Just like a modern TM, it existed virtually as a collective database, waiting for a textual trigger to be activated individually. By bringing together two of the most common textual practices in the Renaissance, mediated translation and commonplacing, and studying their uses of memory, we can understand better issues that are usually labelled under the blanket word "intertextuality"[21]. Rather than make translation one sub-class of intertextuality, or "hypertextuality", both in Genette's literary meaning (Genette 1982, 238ff; 1997, 214ff) and in the meaning developed in information technology[22], we could consider hypertextual, or intertextual phenomena as varieties of translation (Ascham's *translatio linguarum* or *paraphrasis*/*metaphrasis*, a distinction itself indebted to Cicero).

We can also explore issues that arise for present-day translators using CAT tools such as TM and automatic translations (post-editing): what do we translate? (words, sentences, language itself, meaning?); where do we store information and whom do we trust to hold it? (who owns the texts that are used in TM? does post-editing make human mediation disappear or just less visible?). Commonplacing translation segments can make translators more or less visible, as Shakespeare's own authority became more visible in the excerpts from *Venus and Adonis* which ridiculous characters in contemporary plays tried to pass off as products of their own invention. There is probably no better example of the canonising role of translation memory than C. K. Scott Moncrieff's choice to entitle his English translation of Proust's *Recherche du temps perdu* after a line from Shakespeare's Sonnet 30, *Remembrance of Things Past* (1922-1930). Shakespeare himself metonymically becomes a mediating instance in the translation process and in the reception of Proust's work at the same time as the

21 See Lyne 2016 and, most recently, Bigliazzi 2024 and the references therein.

22 See Genette 1982 (French) and 1997 (English translation); Sarah Carter's attempt to provide a hypertextual model for intertextuality does not mention Genette (Carter 2021, chapter 6). I think there is a fruitful tension to explore between the image of the "palimpsest" (which is Genette's own) evoked by Bigliazzi 2024 (n.p., ebook) and that of the hyperlink.

English language is identified as "Shakespeare's" – and, if it did not make Proust the French Shakespeare, Scott Moncrieff's authority as a translator and ownership over the translation of Proust was asserted so strongly that it took over fifty years for the title to be translated more literally as *In Search of Lost Time*.

References

Ascham, Roger. 1970. *The Scholemaster*. London: John Day.

Ausonius, Decius Magnus. 1575. *Opera in meliorem ordinem digesta*. Lyon: Ant. Gryphius.

Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield. 1944. *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 2 vols.

Bate, Jonathan. 1993. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bath, Michael. 1992. *The Image of the Stag: Iconographic Themes in Western Art*. Baden-Baden: Verlag Valentin Koerner.

Belle, Marie-Alice, and Brenda M. Hosington, ed. 2023. *Indirect Translation in Early Modern Britain*, *Philological Quarterly* 102, no. 2-3 (2023).

Bigliazzi, Silvia. 2024. "Introduction." In *Revisiting Shakespeare's Italian Sources. Memory and Reuse*, edited by Silvia Bigliazzi, ebook, n.p. London: Routledge.

Binns, J. W. 1990. *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Bistué, Belén. 2013. *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Blair, Ann. 2010. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bodenham, John. 1600. *Bel-vedére, or, The Garden of the muses*. London: F.K. for Hugh Astley.

Bowker, Lynne. 2002. *Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press/Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Braden, Gordon. 1978. *The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry: Three Case Studies*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Brant, Sebastian. 1509. *Stultifera nauis*. Translated by Alexander Barclay. London: Richard Pynson.

Burrow, Colin. 2004. "Shakespeare and humanistic culture." In *Shakespeare and the Classics*, edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor, 9-28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canter Willem. 1564. *Novarum lectionum libri quatuor*. Basel: Oporinus.

Carter, Sarah. 2021. *Early Modern Intertextuality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. 1534. *The thre bookes of Tyllyes offyces both in latyne tonge [&] in englysshe*. Translated by Robert Whittinton. London: by Wynkyn de Worde.

Clapham, John. 1591. *Narcissus*. London: Thomas Scarlet.

Considine, John. 2004. "Golding, Arthur (1535/6-1606), translator." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online.

Corns, Thomas N. 2000. "The Early Modern Search Engine: Indices, Title Pages, Marginalia and Contents." In *The Renaissance Computer. Knowledge Technology in the First Age of Print*, edited by Jonathan Sawday and Neil Rhodes, 93-102. London: Routledge.

Engel, William E., Rory Loughnane, and Grant Williams. 2016. *The Memory Arts in Renaissance England: A Critical Anthology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enterline, Lynn. 2012. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Genette, Gérard. 1982. *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Gallimard.

—. 1997. *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

Gnaphaeus, Gulielmus. 1540. *Ioannis Palsgraui Londoniensis, ecphrasis Anglica in comoediam Acolasti The comedye of Acolastus translated into oure englysshe tongue*. Translated by John Palsgrave. London: Tho. Berthelet.

Hiscock, Andrew. 2011. *Reading Memory In Early Modern Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hosington, Brenda M. "On Mediated Translation: A Fruitful Dialogue Between Specialists in Translation Studies and Early Modern Translation." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 58, no. 4 (October 2022): 478-87. https://doi.org/10.1093/fmls/cqac054.

Kaske, Carol. 1999. *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Kiernan, Pauline. 2000. "*Venus and Adonis* and Ovidian Indecorous Wit." In *Shakespeare's Ovid: The* Metamorphoses *in the Plays and Poems*, edited by A. B. Taylor, 81-95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knight, Sarah. 2017. "How the Young Man Should Study Latin Poetry: Neo-Latin Literature and Early Modern Education." In *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, edited by Victoria Moul, 52-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. 1879. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lyne, Raphael. *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English Metamorphoses, 1567-1632*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

—. 2016. *Memory and Intertextuality in Renaissance Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mancinus, Dominicus. 1518. *Here begynneth a ryght frutefull treatyse, intituled the myrrour of good maners*. Translated by Alexander Barclay. London: Richard Pynson.

Martindale, Charles and Colin Burrow. 1992. "Clapham's 'Narcissus:' A Pre-Text for Shakespeare's 'Venus and Adonis?' (text, translation, and commentary)." *English Literary Renaissance* 22, no. 2, (Spring 1992): 147-76.

Martindale, Charles and Michelle Martindale. 1990. *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity: An Introductory Essay*. London: Routledge.

Melby, Alan K. and Sue Ellen Wright. 2023. "Translation Memory." In *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology. Second Edition*, edited by Chan Sin-wai, 766-81. Abingdon: Routledge.

Meres, Francis, 1598. *Palladis tamia*. London: P. Short, for Cuthbert Burbie.

Miller, William E. "Double Translation in English Humanistic Education." *Studies in the Renaissance* 10 (1963): 163-74.

Mitkov, Ruslan, 2022. "Translation memory systems." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Memory*, edited by Sharon Deane-Cox and Anneleen Spiessens, 364-80. Abingdon, Routledge.

Moss, Ann. 1996. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. 2006. *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge.

—. 2016. "Shakespeare Using Early Modern Translations." In *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare*, edited by Bruce R. Smith, with Katherine Rowe, Ton Hoenselaars, Akiko Kusunoki,

Andrew Murphy, and Aimara da Cunha Resende, 213-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2017. "Shakespeare and English translations of the classics." In *The Routledge Research Companion to Shakespeare and Classical Literature*, edited by Sean Keilen and Nick Moschovakis, 28-41. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ong, Walter J. "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite." *Studies in Philology* 56, no. 2 (April 1959): 103-24.

Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso). 1513. *The flores of Ouide de arte amandi with theyr englysshe afore them and two alphabete tablys*. London: Wynkyn de Worde.

—. 1565. *The fyrst fovver bookes of P. Ouidius Nasos worke, intitled Metamorphosis*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: William Seres.

—. 1567. *The. xv. bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, entytuled Metamorphosis*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: William Seres.

—. 1589. *P. Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*. London: Richard Field for John Harrison.

Pigman, George W. "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (1980): 1-32.

Pollmann, Judith and Erika Kuijpers. 2013. "Introduction. On the Early Modernity of Modern Memory." In *Memory before Modernity. Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, Jasper van der Steen, 1-23. Leyden: Brill.

Puttenham, George. 1589. *The arte of English poesie*. London: Richard Field.

The Return from Parnassus. 1949. In *The Three Parnassus Plays*, edited by James Blair Leishman. London: Nicholson & Watson.

Rhodes, Neil. "Shakespeare's Computer: Commonplaces/Databases." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook: Where Are We Now in Shakespearean Studies?* 3 (2003): 249-67.

Roberts, Sasha. 2003. *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roe, John. 2000. "Ovid 'Renascent' in *Venus and Adonis* and *Hero and Leander*." In *Shakespeare's Ovid: The* Metamorphoses *in the Plays and Poems*, edited by A. B. Taylor, 31-46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sallust (Caius Sallustius Crispus). 1522. *Here begynneth the famous cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had against Iugurth vsurper of*

the kyngdome of Numidy. Translated by Alexander Barclay. London: Richarde Pynson.

Sansonetti, Laetitia. 2015. "Out-Oviding Ovid in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*". In *The Circulation of Knowledge in Early Modern English Literature*, edited by Sophie Chiari, 175-87. Farnham: Ashgate.

—. 2021. "*Belvedere*, *Englands Helicon*, *Englands Parnassus*: trois anthologies pour construire un canon poétique élisabéthain en 1600." In *Fleurs et jardins de poésie. Les anthologies poétiques au XVIe siècle (domaine français, incursions européennes)*, edited by Adeline Lionetto and Jean-Charles Monferran, 329-54. Paris: Classiques Garnier.

Sawday, Jonathan and Neil Rhodes, ed. 2000. *The Renaissance Computer. Knowledge Technology in the First Age of Print*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Shakespeare, William. 1593. *Venus and Adonis*. London: Richard Field.

—. 1623. *Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies*. London: Isaac Iaggard and Ed. Blount.

Stapleton, M. L. 1997. "Venus as Praeceptor: The *Ars Amatoria* in Venus and Adonis." In Venus and Adonis*: Critical Essays*, edited by Philip C. Kolin, 309-22. New York: Garland.

Sullivan, Garrett A., Jr. 2005. *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama. Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Terence (Publius Terentius Afer). 1483. *Vulgaria quedam abs Terencio in anglicam linguam traducta*. London: W. de Machlina, 1483.

—. 1520. *Terens in englysh*. Paris: P. le Noir [?].

—. 1534. *Floures for Latine spekynge selected and gathered oute of Terence, and the same translated in to Englysshe*. London: Tho. Berthelet.

Thiebaux, Marcelle. 1974. *The Stag of Love. The Chase in Medieval Literature*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Tregear, Ted. 2023. *Anthologizing Shakespeare, 1593-1603*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro). 1581 *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera Bvcolicon Georgicon Aeneis*. Leipzig: Steinmann [for Ernst Vögelin].

Wakelin, Daniel. "Possibilities for Reading: Classical Translations in Parallel Texts ca. 1520-1558." *Studies in Philology* 105, no. 4 (Fall 2008): 463-86.

Woolf, D. R. 2004. "Clapham, John (1566-1619), historian and poet." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online.

Youdale, Roy. 2020. *Using Computers in the Translation of Literary Style. Challenges and Opportunities*, London: Routledge.

— and Andrew Rothwell. 2022. "Computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools, translation memory, and literary translation." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Memory*, edited by Sharon Deane-Cox and Anneleen Spiessens, 381-402. Abingdon: Routledge.